

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN SUPERSYMMETRY SEARCH STRATEGIES*

XERXES TATA

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Hawaii,
Honolulu, HI 96822, USA*

ABSTRACT

After a quick review of the framework for phenomenological analyses of supersymmetry, we summarize current limits on supersymmetric particle masses and discuss strategies for their searches at the Fermilab Tevatron and the LHC. We also discuss the sense in which such searches as well as those that may be carried out at LEP complement one another. Finally, we touch upon the prospects for more ambitious measurements such as those of sparticle masses and couplings. Such measurements could (a) help pin down model parameters, (b) perhaps, serve to test our ideas of physics at very high energy, and (c) provide the most direct test of supersymmetry.

1. Introduction and Model Framework

Aesthetic issues aside, the interest in low energy SUSY phenomenology was originally driven by the recognition that SUSY can stabilize the gauge hierarchy provided sparticles are lighter than $O(1 \text{ TeV})$. More recently, the realization that the precise measurements of the gauge couplings at LEP are in agreement with the minimal supersymmetric model but *incompatible*¹ with its minimal non-supersymmetric counterpart has led several groups² to re-examine the expectations for sparticle masses and mixing patterns within the theoretically appealing supergravity (SUGRA) framework. Experimental constraints from flavour changing neutral currents can readily be accommodated³ and, assuming R -parity is unbroken, SUSY models include a viable candidate for dark matter.⁴

Most phenomenological analyses have been performed within the framework of the Minimal Supersymmetric Model (MSSM), which is a supersymmetrized version of the SM with the least number of additional new particles and interactions necessary for phenomenology.⁵ It is assumed that R -parity is exactly conserved so that the lightest SUSY particle (LSP) is stable. If it is further assumed to be the dark matter in our galactic halo, the LSP can only be the lightest neutralino. Supersymmetry breaking is parametrized by the introduction of soft SUSY breaking mass terms and interactions

*Talk presented at the Eleventh Department of Atomic Energy Symposium, Visvabharati University, Santiniketan, Dec. 28, 1994 - Jan. 2, 1995.

consistent with the SM gauge group. A general analysis requires an unmanageably large number of parameters and, without further assumptions, the phenomenology is intractable. This was not a problem in the earliest analyses when it was assumed that a sparticle always directly decays to ordinary particle(s) and the LSP; in this simple case, the rates for SUSY signals were essentially fixed by the production process, *i.e.* by the mass (and, possibly mixing angles) of the sparticle being searched for. It was subsequently recognized that heavy sparticles decay via a complicated cascade⁶ that terminates in the LSP so that the resulting signals also depend on the masses and couplings of all sparticles that participate in the decay cascade.

Motivated by grand unified theories (GUTs), most early collider studies of SUSY^{7–10} (and also those of today) assumed that the three running gaugino masses originate in a common gaugino mass at some high scale, so that the ratios of these masses evaluated at the weak scale, are proportional to the corresponding ratios of the (known) squared gauge couplings; the $SU(2)$ and $U(1)$ gaugino masses are then determined in terms of $m_{\tilde{g}}$. To further reduce the number of parameters, it was usually assumed that the sfermions were all degenerate (this was motivated by supergravity (SUGRA) model studies); the Higgs boson sector (at tree level) is completely determined by the mass (m_{H_p}) of the neutral pseudoscalar along with the parameters $\tan\beta$, the ratio of the two vacuum expectation values and μ , the superpotential Higgsino mass which also enter the gaugino-Higgsino sector of the model. Together with the A -parameter(s) which affects mainly the phenomenology of third generation squarks, this parameter set completely specifies the model. We will refer to this framework for sparticle masses and mixings as the MSSM.

In view of the fact that the simplifying assumptions underlying these MSSM analyses are motivated by supergravity (SUGRA) GUT models, it seems reasonable to seriously explore their implications. Several phenomenological analyses of SUGRA models have recently appeared in the literature.^{11–14} These models are based on assumptions about the symmetries of interactions at an ultra-high energy scale where the physics is simple. We will not discuss these here, but instead refer the reader to the literature. The effective Lagrangian of the low energy theory is completely specified in terms of just four parameters, renormalized at the high scale, where the assumed symmetries relate many masses and couplings. The evolution of these parameters down to the weak scale relevant to phenomenology* then leads to a diverse pattern of sparticle masses and mixings. Typically, one finds that

- the first two generations of squarks are (approximately) degenerate so that these models automatically satisfy constraints³ from the non-observation of flavour changing neutral currents in the kaon sector, while $\tilde{t}_1$, the lighter t -squark and $\tilde{b}_1 \sim \tilde{b}_L$, the lighter b -squark may be substantially lighter. This can lead to distinctive third generation phenomenology,^{16,17} as well as lead to enhanced production of third generation (s)particles, both directly and via gluino decays.
- Sleptons are lighter than the squarks, and may be much lighter if gluinos and squarks (of the first two generations) have comparable masses. This can lead to

*This is essential to sum large the logarithms arising from the disparity of the two scales.

an enhancement of leptonic decays of neutralinos, and sometimes, also charginos which, in turn, leads to increased cross sections for leptonic signals via which SUSY might reveal itself at colliders.

- An especially attractive property of this framework is that the evolution of the model parameters from the high scale down to the weak scale also triggers the breakdown of electroweak symmetry. Some caution must be exercised in the choice of input parameters to ensure that colour and electromagnetic gauge invariances are not spontaneously broken. This cannot, therefore, be regarded[†] as an explanation of the manifest QCD and electromagnetic gauge invariances. Nonetheless, the fact that the correct breakdown of $SU(2) \times U(1)$ can be obtained over wide ranges of parameters must be regarded as a success of the model. The magnitude of μ is fixed to reproduce the measured Z boson mass.

The particle/sparticle masses and couplings are determined by a few parameters (along with m_t) which may be chosen to be:

$$m_0, m_{1/2}, A_0, \tan \beta \text{ and } \text{sgn}(\mu). \quad (1)$$

The recent version¹⁸ of the supersymmetry simulation program ISAJET 7.13 now gives the reader the option to either input the supergravity parameter set (1) above, or to use the more extended MSSM parameter set for the analysis. The former choice automatically incorporates sparticle masses and decay patterns as given by the restricted SUGRA framework. Because the model is specified by only four input parameters, various experimental observables become correlated. As we will see, these correlations provide non-trivial tests of the underlying extrapolation of our knowledge of physics to very high scales (which could ultimately prove to be incorrect). The sensitivity of the model predictions to SUGRA assumptions can be tested by using the optional MSSM inputs. In this way ISAJET can also be used to simulate models with non-universal soft-breaking sfermion terms.

2. Current Status of Supersymmetry

There is no direct evidence for sparticles in high energy collisions. This is not (yet) a cause for despair since, if we regard fine-tuning issue as the motivation for low energy SUSY, we would typically expect sparticle masses around 100-1000 GeV. Since SUSY theories are of the decoupling type in that virtual effects of sparticles decouple as $m_{SUSY} \rightarrow \infty$, the non-observation¹⁹ of any significant deviations from the Standard Model (SM) in precision experiments at LEP is compatible with (though not an argument for) low energy SUSY.

The most straightforward limits on masses of sparticles with gauge couplings to the Z come from a measurement of its total width; these limits on the mass of the charged slepton and sneutrino, the squark and the chargino ($\widetilde{W}_1$), which are independent of how sparticles decay, are a few GeV below the kinematic bound $M_Z/2$.

[†]It should also be pointed out that this requires that the input parameters at the ultra-high scale be $O(1 \text{ TeV})$. A complete understanding should include the explanation of why the values of these parameters renormalized at a scale $\sim 10^{16-18} \text{ GeV}$ should be just $\sim 1 \text{ TeV}$.

Exclusive searches and the measurement of the invisible and leptonic widths of the Z yield (sparticle decay-dependent) lower limits²⁰ even closer to $M_Z/2$. Since neutralinos ($\tilde{Z}_i$) couple to the Z only via their Higgsino components, the bounds on their masses are sensitive to model parameters which determine the mixing patterns.

The search for squarks and gluinos, because of their strong interactions, is best performed at hadron colliders. The non-observation of an excess of $\cancel{E}_T$ events at the Tevatron has enabled the D0 collaboration²¹ to infer lower limits of about 150 GeV on their masses, improving on the earlier limit of ~ 100 GeV obtained by CDF²²; if $m_{\tilde{q}} = m_{\tilde{g}}$, the mass bound improves to 205 GeV. These bounds, which assume ten flavours of degenerate squarks, have some sensitivity to the model parameters which determine the cascade decay patterns of the $\tilde{q}$ and $\tilde{g}$. Within the minimal model, the Tevatron and LEP bounds together imply²⁴ a lower bound just above 20 GeV on the mass of the $\tilde{Z}_1$ which, because $\tilde{Z}_1$ is assumed to be the stable LSP, may have some cosmological significance.

There are also constraints from “low energy” experiments and from cosmology. Some judgement must be exercised in evaluating these constraints which can frequently be evaded by minor modifications of the model. For example, the constraint from an over-abundance of LSPs leading to too short-lived a universe might be evaded by allowing a tiny violation of R-parity conservation without impact on collider searches.[‡] Proton decay constraints²³ are sensitive to details about GUT scale physics. Finally, we remark that flavour violating decays, *e.g.* inclusive $b \rightarrow s\gamma$ recently measured by CLEO²⁵ serve to restrict the *sum* of new physics contributions. Since it is frequently possible for partial cancellations amongst these, care must be exercised in extracting limits on sparticle masses from these data.

3. SUSY Search in the 1990’s

The LEP collider is expected to enter its second phase of operation around the end of next year when its energy will be upgraded to 175-200 GeV. Given a data sample of $O(100 \text{ pb}^{-1})$, the clean environment of e^+e^- collisions will readily enable experimentalists to search for charginos, sleptons, squarks²⁶ and even Higgs bosons²⁷ with masses up to 85-90 GeV (b -tagging capability may be necessary if $m_H \simeq M_Z$). The corresponding mass reach for neutralinos is sensitive to (model-dependent) mixing angles. The process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tilde{Z}_1\tilde{Z}_2$ may enable experiments to probe parameter values that cannot be probed via chargino pair production.

At the Tevatron, gluino and squark production processes dominate the production of the less massive charginos and neutralinos for gluino masses up to 320 GeV (200 GeV) if $m_{\tilde{q}} = m_{\tilde{g}}$ ($m_{\tilde{q}} = 2m_{\tilde{g}}$). Thus, while gluinos and squark signals may be the best way to search for SUSY at present, the ultimate reach of (a very high luminosity upgrade of) the Tevatron may well be determined by the trilepton signal from $\tilde{W}_1\tilde{Z}_2$ production. The production of charginos or neutralinos in association with squarks and gluinos is never dominant.

[‡]It is perfectly possible to construct phenomenologically viable models that violate R -parity conservation. We do not discuss these here for reasons of time.

The D0 and CDF experiments have collectively accumulated an integrated luminosity in excess of 100 pb^{-1} and will continue to accumulate data for several more months. In addition to extending the $\cancel{E}_T$ search region, the large increase in the data sample (relative to their earlier analyses which were based on a $\sim 10 \text{ pb}^{-1}$) should enable them to (i) perform gluino and squark searches via multilepton events from their cascade decays, (ii) search for $\tilde{W}_1 \tilde{Z}_2$ production via isolated trilepton events free of jet activity, and (iii) search for the lighter t -squark, $\tilde{t}_1$. The Tevatron is unlikely to be able to detect sleptons beyond the range of LEP.²⁸

Multilepton Signals from Gluinos and Squarks. The conventional $\cancel{E}_T$ search for $\tilde{g}$ and $\tilde{q}$ is background limited. Even with an integrated luminosity of 1 fb^{-1} that should be available with the Main Injector upgrade of the Tevatron, we anticipate a maximum reach of $\sim 270 \text{ GeV}$ ($\sim 350 \text{ GeV}$) if $m_{\tilde{q}} \gg m_{\tilde{g}}$ ($m_{\tilde{q}} \simeq m_{\tilde{g}}$) in this channel.^{29,30} Heavy gluinos and squarks can also decay via the $\tilde{W}_1$ and $\tilde{Z}_2$ modes which, unless suppressed by phase space, frequently dominate the decays of $\tilde{q}_L$ and $\tilde{g}$. The subsequent leptonic decays of the $\tilde{W}_1$ and $\tilde{Z}_2$ yield events with hard jets accompanied by 1-3 isolated, hard leptons and $\cancel{E}_T$. The cross sections for various event topologies, with cuts described in Ref.[31] is shown in Fig. 1. Our simulation includes the simultaneous production of all sparticles. Thus, for very large values of $m_{\tilde{g}}$, the cross sections are dominated by events from chargino and neutralino production.

While there are substantial backgrounds to 1ℓ and $\ell^+\ell^-$ event topologies, the *physics* backgrounds in the $\ell^\pm\ell^\pm$ and 3ℓ channels are essentially negligible, so that these search channels are essentially rate limited. These channels, which at the Main Injector have a reach³¹ of 230-400 GeV (for $\mu < 0$) depending on $m_{\tilde{q}}$ and $m_{\tilde{g}}$, provide complementary ways of searching for gluinos and squarks at the Tevatron, and because they are free of SM backgrounds, may even prove superior if gluinos and squarks are very heavy, and the branching fraction for the decay $\tilde{Z}_2 \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-\tilde{Z}_1$ is not strongly suppressed.[§]

Search for Isolated Trilepton Events. Associated $\tilde{W}_1 \tilde{Z}_2$ production which occurs by s -channel W^* and t -channel $\tilde{q}$ exchanges, followed by the leptonic decays of $\tilde{W}_1$ and $\tilde{Z}_2$ results in isolated trilepton plus $\cancel{E}_T$ events, with hadronic activity only from QCD radiation. SM backgrounds to the $3\ell + n_{jet} \leq 1$ signal are negligible, assuming that WZ events can be vetoed with high efficiency by requiring $m_{\ell\bar{\ell}} \neq M_Z$ within experimental resolution; a conclusive observation of a handful of such events would, therefore, be a signal for new physics. The branching fraction for leptonic decays of $\tilde{Z}_2$, and sometimes also of $\tilde{W}_1$, and hence, this signal, is enhanced, especially for negative values of μ , if $m_{\tilde{\ell}} \ll m_{\tilde{q}}$ and the $\tilde{Z}_2 \tilde{Z}_1 Z$ coupling is dynamically suppressed; this situation frequently occurs in SUGRA type models, if $m_{\tilde{q}} \simeq m_{\tilde{g}}$. On the other hand, if $\mu > 0$ this decay may be strongly suppressed. Preliminary analyses by the CDF and D0 experiments³² (for large values of the Higgsino mass parameter, μ) are already competitive with bounds from LEP. These experiments may soon explore^{33,29} parameter ranges not accessible at LEP and, under favourable circumstances, may be competitive with LEP II during

[§]Due to complicated interference effects, a strong suppression of this decay occurs for certain ranges of parameters if $\mu > 0$, so that the reach in especially the 3ℓ channel requires further study.

Fig. 1. Tevatron ($\sqrt{s} = 1.8$ TeV) cross sections in fb for various event topologies after the cuts of Ref.[31] from which this figure is taken. We take $\mu = -m_{\tilde{g}}$, $\tan\beta = 2$, $m_{H_p} = 500$ GeV, and set the weak scale A parameters equal to $-m_{\tilde{q}}$. The $\cancel{E}_T$ cross sections are shown by diamonds, 1ℓ cross sections by crosses, $\ell^+\ell^-$ cross sections by x's and the same sign dilepton cross sections by squares. The dotted and dashed curves show the trilepton and 4ℓ cross sections, respectively. The $m_{\tilde{g}} = 150$ GeV case in Fig. 1b is excluded by LEP constraints since this scenario has $m_{\tilde{\nu}} = 26$ GeV.

the Main Injector Era. The reach of the Main Injector and of TeV*, the proposed high luminosity upgrade of the Tevatron designed to provide an integrated luminosity of $\sim 25 fb^{-1}$, in the 3ℓ channel has recently been studied^{29,34,30} within the SUGRA framework.

The region of the $m_0 - m_{1/2}$ plane where the signals may be statistically significant is shown in Fig. 2 for $\tan\beta = 2$ and $A_0 = 0$. The solid squares denote where the signal should be observable at the 5σ level with an integrated luminosity of $1 fb^{-1}$. The remaining squares show the corresponding regions where the signal is expected to be observable at the TeV* upgrade. We see from Fig. 2a that for $\mu < 0$, the clean trilepton signal should be observable at the 5σ level for most values of parameters where the “spoiler” decays $\tilde{Z}_2 \rightarrow \tilde{Z}_1 H_\ell$ are not kinematically allowed. In contrast, for positive values of μ shown in Fig. 2b, there is a large region for $400 \text{ GeV} \lesssim m_0 \lesssim 1000 \text{ GeV}$ which even the TeV* may not be able to probe even for charginos just beyond the current LEP reach[¶].

[¶]Our conclusion is at variance with what has been stated in the literature,²⁹ and is because of the strong suppression of the neutralino branching fraction mentioned above.

Searching for Top Squarks at the Tevatron. The large Yukawa interactions of the top family which mix $\tilde{t}_L$ and $\tilde{t}_R$ serve to reduce the mass of $\tilde{t}_1$, the lighter of the two mass eigenstates. In fact, it is theoretically possible that $\tilde{t}_1$ is essentially massless with other squarks and gluinos all too heavy to be produced at the Tevatron. The Tevatron lower limits on $m_{\tilde{q}}$, are derived assuming ten degenerate squark flavours, and so are not applicable to $\tilde{t}_1$. Currently, the best limit, $m_{\tilde{t}_1} \gtrsim M_Z/2$, comes from LEP experiments; this bound can be evaded if the stop mixing angle and $m_{\tilde{t}_1} - m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$ are both fine-tuned, a possibility we do not entertain here.

The signals from top squark production depend on its decay patterns. For $m_{\tilde{t}_1} < 125$ GeV, the range of interest at the Tevatron, $\tilde{t}_1$ decays via the loop-mediated mode, $\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c\tilde{Z}_1$ when the tree level decay $\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow b\tilde{W}_1$ is kinematically forbidden.³⁵ Stop pair production is then signalled by $\cancel{E}_T$ events from its direct decays to the LSP. With a data sample of 100 pb^{-1} , Tevatron experiments should be able¹⁷ to probe stop masses up to 80-100 GeV, significantly beyond the present bounds. The tree level chargino mode dominates stop decays whenever it is kinematically allowed. The subsequent leptonic decay of one (or both) of the charginos lead to single lepton (dilepton) + b -jet(s) + $\cancel{E}_T$ events, very similar to those expected from $t\bar{t}$ pair production. Top production is thus a formidable background to the stop signal.¹⁶ Special cuts need to be devised to separate stop from top events. Since stops accessible at the Tevatron are considerably lighter than m_t , and because the chargino, unlike W , decays via three body modes into a *massive* LSP, stop events are generally softer than top events. It has been shown¹⁷ that by requiring $m_T(\ell\cancel{E}_T) < 45$ GeV ($p_T(\ell^+) + p_T(\ell^-) + \cancel{E}_T < 100$ GeV), in addition to other canonical cuts, stops with masses up to about 100 GeV should be detectable in the 1ℓ (dilepton) channel by the end of the current Tevatron run; for top squark detection in the single lepton channel, sufficient b -tagging capability is also required.

4. Supersymmetry Searches at Supercolliders

We have seen above that direct searches at the Main Injector and LEP II will probe particle masses between 80-300 GeV; even assuming the gaugino mass unification condition, the chargino search, by inference, will probe gluino masses at most up to about 400-500 GeV. Indeed while the TeV* may be able to probe sparticle masses significantly beyond the reach of other collider facilities of the era for favourable values of parameters, it should be kept in mind that it may not be able to probe (even indirectly via the clean trilepton channel) gluino masses much beyond about 250-300 GeV if squarks are heavy and μ is positive. Since the SUSY mass scale could easily be as large as 1 TeV, it will, unless sparticles have already been discovered, be up to supercolliders such as the LHC at CERN or an e^+e^- Linear Collider (*LC) to explore the remainder of the parameter space.

4.1. Searches at Hadron Supercolliders

At the LHC, the production of gluinos and squarks remains the dominant mechanism for sparticle production for masses in excess of 1 TeV. The cascade decays of the gluinos and squarks lead to multi-jet plus multi-lepton plus $\cancel{E}_T$ event topologies. In the $\cancel{E}_T$ channel, the LHC can search^{36,37} for gluinos and squarks with masses between 300 GeV up to about 1.3 TeV (2.0 TeV) for $m_{\tilde{q}} \gg m_{\tilde{g}}$ ($m_{\tilde{q}} = m_{\tilde{g}}$). It is instructive

Table 1. Estimates of the discovery reach of various options of future hadron colliders. The signals have mainly been computed for negative values of μ . We expect that the reach in especially the $all \rightarrow 3\ell$ channel will be sensitive to the sign of μ . The two entries for the $\cancel{E}_T$ channel refer to results of two independent analyses.

Signal	Tevatron II 0.1 fb ⁻¹ 1.8 TeV	Main Injector 1 fb ⁻¹ 2 TeV	Tevatron* 10 fb ⁻¹ 2 TeV	DiTevatron 1 fb ⁻¹ 4 TeV	LHC 10 fb ⁻¹ 14 TeV
$\cancel{E}_T(\tilde{q} \gg \tilde{g})$	$\tilde{g}(210)/\tilde{g}(185)$	$\tilde{g}(270)/\tilde{g}(200)$	$\tilde{g}(340)/\tilde{g}(200)$	$\tilde{g}(450)/\tilde{g}(300)$	$\tilde{g}(1300)$
$l^\pm l^\pm(\tilde{q} \gg \tilde{g})$	$\tilde{g}(160)$	$\tilde{g}(210)$	$\tilde{g}(270)$	$\tilde{g}(320)$	
$all \rightarrow 3\ell(\tilde{q} \gg \tilde{g})$	$\tilde{g}(180)$	$\tilde{g}(260)$	$\tilde{g}(430)$	$\tilde{g}(320)$	
$\cancel{E}_T(\tilde{q} \sim \tilde{g})$	$\tilde{g}(300)/\tilde{g}(245)$	$\tilde{g}(350)/\tilde{g}(265)$	$\tilde{g}(400)/\tilde{g}(265)$	$\tilde{g}(580)/\tilde{g}(470)$	$\tilde{g}(2000)$
$l^\pm l^\pm(\tilde{q} \sim \tilde{g})$	$\tilde{g}(180 - 230)$	$\tilde{g}(320 - 325)$	$\tilde{g}(385 - 405)$	$\tilde{g}(460)$	$\tilde{g}(1000)$
$all \rightarrow 3\ell(\tilde{q} \sim \tilde{g})$	$\tilde{g}(240 - 290)$	$\tilde{g}(425 - 440)$	$\tilde{g}(550^*)$	$\tilde{g}(550^*)$	$\gtrsim \tilde{g}(1000)$
$\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow c\tilde{Z}_1$	$\tilde{t}_1(80-100)$	$\tilde{t}_1(120)$			
$\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow b\tilde{W}_1$	$\tilde{t}_1(80-100)$	$\tilde{t}_1(120)$			
$\Theta(\tilde{t}_1\tilde{t}_1^*) \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$	—	—	—	—	$\tilde{t}_1(250)$
$\tilde{l}\tilde{l}^*$	$\tilde{l}(50)$	$\tilde{l}(50)$	$\tilde{l}(50)$		$\tilde{l}(250-300)$

to note that the same sign dilepton and several multilepton signals *must* simultaneously be present⁸ if any $\cancel{E}_T$ signal is to be attributed to squark and gluino production, though their relative rates could be sensitive to the entire sparticle spectrum. The rate for like-sign dilepton^{8,38} plus $\cancel{E}_T$ events is enormous for $m_{\tilde{g}} \leq 300$ GeV; this ensures there is no window between the Tevatron and the LHC where gluino of the MSSM may escape detection.^{8,36} Gluinos and squarks with masses up to about 1 TeV should be detectable in these channels. Gluinos and squarks may also be a source of high p_T $Z + \cancel{E}_T$ events at the LHC.

Experiments at the LHC can also search for “hadron-free” trilepton events from $\tilde{W}_1\tilde{Z}_2$ production. Backgrounds from top quark production can be very effectively suppressed³⁹ by requiring that the two hardest leptons have the same sign of charge. The signal again becomes unobservable when the two-body spoiler modes $\tilde{Z}_2 \rightarrow (Z \text{ or } H_\ell) + \tilde{Z}_1$ become accessible. For positive values of μ there still remain holes in the parameter space where this signal is unobservable, even if the spoiler channels are closed. The dilepton mass distribution in $\ell^+\ell^-\ell'$ events can be used to reliably measure $m_{\tilde{Z}_2} - m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$.

Selectrons and smuons with masses up to 250 GeV (300 GeV if it is possible to veto central jets with an efficiency of 99%) should also be detectable.²⁸ Finally, we note that with an integrated luminosity of 100 fb⁻¹ the $\gamma\gamma$ decays of scalar stoponium has been argued to allow for the detection of $\tilde{t}_1$ with a mass up to 250 GeV, assuming $\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow b\tilde{W}_1$ (and, perhaps, also $\tilde{t}_1 \rightarrow bW\tilde{Z}_1$) is kinematically forbidden.⁴⁰

The reach of various proposed and approved hadron collider facilities is summarized in Table 1. Although we have not discussed it explicitly, we have also included the DiTevatron, a proposed 4 TeV upgrade of the Tevatron, and assumed an integrated luminosity of 1 fb⁻¹. This Table³⁰ clearly reiterates our earlier point that weak scale supersymmetry can only be thoroughly explored at supercolliders.

4.2. e^+e^- Supercolliders

Charged sparticles (and sneutrinos, if $m_{\tilde{\nu}} > m_{\tilde{W}_1}$) should be readily detectable at the *LC if their pair production is kinematically accessible.⁴¹ Unfortunately, most detailed e^+e^- studies to date do not incorporate the cascade decays⁴² of sparticles.^{||} These machines are also an ideal facility for detection and a study of the properties of the Higgs sector. While the detection of Higgs bosons beyond the reach of LEP II is possible at the LHC (except possibly for the well-known “hole” in the $m_{H_p} - \tan\beta$ parameter plane) it requires excellent performance of both the machine and the detectors.^{36,44} In contrast, the detection of Higgs bosons at these facilities is relatively easy, and for favourable values of parameters, it may even be possible to distinguish the Higgs sector of the SM and that of SUSY.⁴⁵

A 500 GeV e^+e^- collider will be able to search for charginos essentially all the way up to the beam energy. If we assume gaugino mass unification, this corresponds to a gluino mass reach of about 700-800 GeV. The real power of these machines, however, lies in the ability to do precision experiments which can then be used to probe¹¹ unified models of interactions as discussed shortly.

5. Supergravity Phenomenology

We have seen that SUGRA GUT models provide an attractive and economic framework for SUSY phenomenology. Their economy derives from the fact that with well-motivated assumptions about physics at an ultra-high scale, all sparticle properties are determined by just the small parameter set (1). It is remarkable that even the simplest SUGRA GUTs are consistent with experimental constraints as well as cosmology.^{12,13} Nevertheless, since the model is based on untested assumptions, it is essential to devise tests that can, in principle, falsify the framework.

As mentioned in Sec. 1, since the phenomenology is determined in terms of just four SUSY parameters, various SUSY cross sections become correlated. Different experimental analyses from e^+e^- and hadron colliders can thus be consistently combined into a single framework¹⁴; since various searches frequently probe different parts of the parameter space they often complement one another. This is illustrated in the $m_0 - m_{1/2}$ plane in Fig. 3 for the Tevatron,¹⁴ and in Fig. 4 for the LHC.³⁷ The grey region (brick-covered region) in Fig. 3 (Fig. 4) is excluded by theoretical constraints: either the correct electroweak symmetry breaking pattern with the experimental value of M_Z is not obtained, or the lightest neutralino is not the LSP. The hatched region is excluded by current experiments. The dashed and dashed-dotted lines in Fig. 3 denote the regions where sleptons and charginos might be detectable at LEP II or the Tevatron, while the dotted lines mark the boundaries of the “spoiler modes” of the $\tilde{Z}_2$. The corresponding regions along with the boundary of the region where sleptons might be detectable at the LHC (denoted as $\tilde{\ell}_R(200)$) as well as the boundary of the region

^{||}The production and cascade decays of sparticles by e^+e^- collisions has now been incorporated into ISAJET, as well as in SUSYGEN, a Monte Carlo program⁴³ that includes initial state radiation and interfaces with the LUND JETSET hadronization routines. Both ISAJET and SUSYGEN currently lack spin correlations, final state decay matrix elements and the possibility of simulations with polarized beams.

where the $\cancel{E}_T$ signal from gluinos and squarks is observable above background at the 5σ level is shown in Fig. 4. We see that before the advent of the supercollider era, the various signals in Fig. 3 probe complementary regions of the parameter plane (the reach in the $\cancel{E}_T$ channel is 200-250 GeV depending on the squark mass). In contrast, Fig. 4 shows that the $\cancel{E}_T$ signal probes much farther than the other signals at the LHC. It should be kept in mind, that part of this plane may also be probed via the same sign and multilepton signals from gluinos and squarks. This is under study. We note here that enhanced decays of gluinos to third generation fermions and sfermions discussed in Sec. 1 are an important source of multilepton events, over and above the usually studied gluino and squark cascade decays to charginos and neutralinos.

At e^+e^- supercolliders, it has been shown that it should be possible^{41,11} to measure the masses of charginos, sleptons with a precision of a few GeV, assuming that they directly decay to the LSP. It has also been shown that a similar precision can be attained in the measurement of squark masses.⁴⁶ These mass measurements should make it possible to test the assumed unification of scalar masses in SUGRA models: Unmixed squark and sleptons masses should be generation independent.** They are related to one another if we further assume the desert hypothesis as in minimal SUGRA GUTs, but to test this relation, knowledge of gaugino masses is necessary.

The availability of polarized beams essentially doubles the number of observables and allows for other interesting tests of this framework. For example, if $\tilde{e}_R$ and $\tilde{W}_1$ are both kinematically accessible, a global fit from the measurement of $m_{\tilde{W}_1}$, $m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$, $m_{\tilde{e}_R}$, together with cross sections $\sigma_R(\tilde{e}_R\tilde{e}_R)$ and $\sigma_R(\tilde{W}_1\tilde{W}_1)$ from right-handed electron beams, would allow the determination of the two electroweak gaugino masses, $\tan\beta$ and μ (with a precision depending on where we are in parameter space). This enables a test of the unification of gaugino masses at about the 5% level.¹¹

We thus see that the observation of sparticles would not only be a spectacular new discovery, but a measurement of their properties, particularly at future colliders would test various SUGRA assumptions, and so, serve as a telescope to the unification scale.

6. More Ambitious Measurements

6.1. How do we tell it is SUSY?

It is well known that the clean environment of e^+e^- colliders allows for precision studies of any new physics that might be accessible. We have already seen that it should be possible to measure particle masses to a precision of a few percent. Measurements of angular distributions readily allow for the determination of particle spin,^{26,41} at least for the lighter sparticles that directly decay to the LSP. The observation of several new particles with the spin, charge and colour quantum numbers of the predicted sparticles would be very strong evidence for supersymmetry. However, the most definitive test of (softly broken) supersymmetry comes from the fact that, exactly as in spontaneously broken gauge theories, the relationships between the dimensionless couplings implied by the (super)symmetry continue to be preserved, while the corresponding relationships

**This is important since an alternative proposal⁴⁷ for suppressing flavour changing neutral currents does not require squarks to be degenerate.

between sparticle masses might be badly violated. For instance, the coupling of the photino to the lepton-slepton system is, apart from a Clebsch-Gordan coefficient, exactly the same as the usual electromagnetic coupling of the photon to an electron pair. Such relationships between various couplings in a softly broken SUSY theory are direct consequences of the underlying supersymmetry, and differ from the tests discussed in the last section. These latter assume supersymmetry and test the various assumptions about the symmetries of interactions at the high scale that form the underpinnings of SUGRA GUT models, but do not directly test SUSY.

These direct tests of SUSY are complicated by the fact that generally speaking, the physical particles are unknown mixtures of states with different $SU(2) \times U(1)$ quantum numbers. It is only after the mixing patterns are untangled can the SUSY relations be tested. Obviously, this requires precise measurements of a large number of observables.

The feasibility of testing SUSY relations between the couplings at a 500 GeV e^+e^- collider has been examined by Feng *et. al.*⁴⁸ Here, we illustrate the basic idea with an example involving pair production of charginos. The starting point is that assuming only the MSSM field content but not supersymmetry, the 2×2 chargino mass matrix can obviously be written in terms of four real parameters. They then observe that for the case where the chargino is a substantial mixture of the Higgsino and the gaugino, both $\widetilde{W}_1\widetilde{W}_1$ and $\widetilde{W}_2\widetilde{W}_1$ production is kinematically possible at a 500 GeV linear collider if the masses are as in the MSSM. Based on earlier studies^{41,11} they assume that these chargino masses will be accurately measured. Next, they observe that a measurement of $\sigma_R(\widetilde{W}_1\widetilde{W}_1)$, the pair production cross section for right-handed electron beam (this does not couple to sneutrinos), and a suitably defined⁴⁸ forward-backward asymmetry suffices to determine the gaugino-Higgsino mixing angles ϕ_L and ϕ_R of the two chiral components of $\widetilde{W}_1^-$. The experimental determination of the two masses and the two mixing angles is then used to determine the four parameters of the chargino mass matrix^{††}. As is well known, the squared sum of the off diagonal elements is fixed by supersymmetry to be $2M_W^2$, so that an experimental verification of this would indeed amount to a direct confirmation of supersymmetry. It is shown that with an integrated luminosity of 100 fb^{-1} it should be possible to test this relation with a precision of 15-20%. A different set of measurements⁴⁸ serves to test the SUSY relation with similar precision in the case that the chargino is dominantly a gaugino.

6.2. Mass Measurements at Hadron Supercolliders

As we have already mentioned, it is possible to make rather precise measurements of sparticle masses in the clean environment of an e^+e^- collider. However, unlike the LHC, the construction of these machines has not yet been approved, and it is possible that these may become operational several years after the LHC commences operation.^{††}

^{††}Further details as well as other complications not discussed here are may be found in the original paper⁴⁸ along with other tests of supersymmetry

^{††}In this case, it would be important to archive the LHC data in appropriate format for subsequent re-analysis, particularly of cascade decays, in light of new information on chargino and neutralino properties from experiments at the e^+e^- collider.

It is then of interest to ask whether it is possible to obtain some measure of sparticle masses despite the relatively messy environment of hadron collisions. This would be possible if one can isolate a relatively clean sample of signal events from a *single* SUSY process, *i.e.* relatively free both from SM backgrounds *and* with only small contributions from other SUSY processes. An analysis of event shape variables would then lead to some information about SUSY masses.

One process for which this strategy has been shown³⁹ to work rather well is for the clean trilepton signal from $\tilde{W}_1\tilde{Z}_2$ production. These authors have identified a set of cuts which not only eliminate the SM backgrounds, but also reduce the contributions from gluino and squark cascade decays as well as from associated production processes (which would otherwise dominate the trilepton signal) to acceptable levels. For the case of negative μ which they studied in detail, sufficiently many signal events remain after the cuts so that the end point of the $m(\ell\bar{\ell})$ distribution in $\ell\bar{\ell}\ell'$ events yields a reliable measure of $m_{\tilde{Z}_2} - m_{\tilde{Z}_1}$. A study of other distributions may provide constraints on other combinations of the chargino and neutralino masses.

Is it possible to measure the mass of the gluino which will perhaps be the most copiously produced sparticle? Several strategies have been proposed in the literature. In the first instance,⁴⁹ associated production processes such as $\tilde{g}\tilde{Z}_1$ were examined using parton level event generators. If these events could be singled out, then the ambiguities from producing and decaying *two* strongly interacting sparticles are bypassed. In practice, rather hard cuts were required to separate the $\tilde{g}\tilde{Z}_1$ events from $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ events. Ultimately, it was concluded that this reaction might be of use only if $m_{\tilde{g}} \lesssim 350$ GeV. In a subsequent study,³⁸ it was claimed that $m_{\tilde{g}}$ could be measured to 15% by focussing on same-sign isolated dilepton events from $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ production, where each gluino decays via $\tilde{g} \rightarrow q\bar{q}\tilde{W}_1$, with $\tilde{W}_1 \rightarrow \ell\nu_\ell\tilde{Z}_1$. The idea was to divide each event into two hemispheres and use the larger of the invariant masses in the two hemispheres as an estimator of $m_{\tilde{g}}$. However, these conclusions may be overly optimistic, since this study considered only a single production mechanism ($\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ production— whereas same sign dileptons can come from various SUSY sources), a single cascade decay chain, and neglected effects of additional QCD radiation. Very recently, it has been shown,³⁷ that it may be possible to measure $m_{\tilde{g}}$ from the $\cancel{E}_T$ sample by using eigenvectors for the construction of the transverse sphericity to again³⁸ divide the event into two halves and constructing the invariant mass of the jets in each hemisphere. With carefully chosen cuts, the distributions of M_{est} , the larger of these two invariant masses, are sufficiently distinct for values of $m_{\tilde{g}}$ differing by 15-25%, depending on $m_{\tilde{q}}$. Monte Carlo studies should, therefore, enable a measurement of $m_{\tilde{g}}$ with roughly the same precision. This last analysis includes the production of all sparticles in the simulation as well as contamination to the jet masses from QCD radiation. It would be interesting to test if the method survives a complete detector simulation.

Finally, one may ask whether it is possible to tell what sparticles are contributing to a SUSY event sample. For the case of clean trileptons where it is possible to devise cuts to minimise other SUSY sources as just discussed, this is moot. A more interesting question is to ask if the production of squarks makes a significant sample to the $\cancel{E}_T$ and multilepton samples from SUSY. Possible strategies for identifying the presence of squarks in SUSY events include:

- A study of the charged asymmetry in the same sign dilepton sample — more up type squarks are expected to be produced in pp collisions, so that the number of $\ell^+\ell^+$ events should be larger than $\ell^-\ell^-$ events.⁸ This might be possible if gluinos and squarks are indeed the main source of same sign dileptons, but this is not guaranteed.
- Since gluinos decay via three body processes and frequently have lengthier cascades than squarks ($\tilde{q}_R$ often decays directly to the LSP), it is reasonable to expect a higher jet multiplicity for the case when $m_{\tilde{q}} \gg m_{\tilde{g}}$, *i.e.* when $\tilde{g}\tilde{g}$ production dominates. This has been studied³⁷ using ISAJET and it has been found that despite contamination from QCD radiation, the $\cancel{E}_T$ sample generated with $m_{\tilde{q}} \gg m_{\tilde{g}}$, exhibits about half a unit larger multiplicity than the corresponding sample with $m_{\tilde{q}} \sim m_{\tilde{g}}$. Of course, the jet multiplicity distributions are sensitive to the sparticle masses, so that it is necessary to have some idea of these masses before conclusions can be drawn.

There are many other questions one may ask. Can one tell the presence of third generation squarks in SUSY events? Can one tell the presence of Higgs bosons produced via SUSY cascades? The answers to both questions are positive for at least some regions of parameter space. The multiplicity of tagged b -jets^{8,50} provides a good handle for this purpose. In fact, in some regions, the $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ signal may be identifiable³⁷ as a bump in the invariant mass distribution of tagged b jet pairs. For this, one obviously needs a large number of tagged b jets from Higgs boson decay in events that do not simultaneously contain other sources of b -jets which would produce a large combinatorial background. Another requirement for the observation of the Higgs bump is that the rate from other sources of b -jets (*e.g.* from $\tilde{g} \rightarrow \tilde{t}_1 t$ or $\tilde{b}_1 b$ events, where the squarks may be real or virtual) should not be overwhelmingly large.

Hadron colliders are generally regarded as discovery machines, and it is widely believed that it will be very difficult to measure the masses or elucidate the physics of any new particles that are produced. However, the examples given above show that this is not entirely correct. Such studies have only just begun, and it remains to be seen just what other information can be gleaned from new physics event samples in spite of the messy environment of hadron colliders.

7. Final Remarks

To conclude, if low energy supersymmetry is indeed the physics that stabilizes the electroweak scale, it will be unlikely to escape detection at the LHC or at future e^+e^- colliders with $\sqrt{s} \gtrsim 500 - 800$ GeV. While Tevatron upgrades indeed probe substantial regions of SUSY parameter space, a non-observation of any signal will not exclude weak scale SUSY. Supercolliders appear to be essential for a comprehensive exploration of the parameter space as well as for the elucidation of any signals that may be found. We cannot overstress the complementary nature of e^+e^- and hadron supercolliders if SUSY is present at the weak scale. Experiments at these facilities not only will unambiguously confirm or exclude the existence of sparticles, but will allow a comprehensive study of their properties which, in turn, may provide us information about physics at an ultra-high energy scale.

Acknowledgements: It is a pleasure to thank Asim Ray, Ranabir Dutt and their colleagues for arranging this meeting in the marvellous atmosphere of Santiniketan, and especially for their unrelenting efforts to accommodate the needs of various participants. Collaborations and discussions with H. Baer, A. Bartl, M. Brhlik, M. Bisset, C-H. Chen, M. Drees, R. Godbole, J. Gunion, C. Kao, R. Munroe, H. Murayama, M. Nojiri, F. Paige, S. Protopopescu, J. Sender and J. Woodside from whom I have learnt much are gratefully acknowledged. This research was supported by the U.S. Dept. of Energy grant DE-FG-03-94ER40833.

References

1. U. Amaldi, W. de Boer and H. Fürstenau, Phys. Lett. **B260**, 447 (1991); J. Ellis, S. Kelley and D. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. **B260**, 131 (1991); P. Langacker and M. Luo, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 817 (1991).
2. G. Ross and R. G. Roberts, Nucl. Phys. **B377**, 571 (1992); R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 725 (1992); M. Drees and M. M. Nojiri, Nucl. Phys. **B369**, 54 (1993); S. Kelley *et. al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B398**, 3 (1993); M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, Nucl. Phys. **B404**, 590 (1993); V. Barger, M. Berger and P. Ohmann, *ibid.* **49**, 4908 (1994); G. Kane, C. Kolda, L. Roszkowski and J. Wells, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 6173 (1994); D. J. Castaño, E. Piard and P. Ramond, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 4882 (1994); W. de Boer, R. Ehret and D. Kazakov, Karlsruhe preprint, IEKP-KA/94-05 (1994).
3. B. Campbell, Phys. Rev. **D28**, 209 (1983); F. Gabbiani and A. Masiero, Nucl. Phys. **B322**, 235 (1989).
4. H. Goldberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1419 (1983); J. Ellis, K. Olive, D. Nanopoulos, J. Hagelin and M. Srednicki, Nucl. Phys. **B328**, 453 (1984). For a more recent discussion in the context of minimal supergravity, see *e.g.* M. Drees and M. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 376 (1993). See also S. Sarkar, (*these proceedings*).
5. For a review of the minimal model and SUSY phenomenology, see H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rep. **110**, 1 (1984); H. Haber and G. Kane, Phys. Rep. **117**, 75 (1985); X. Tata, in *The Standard Model and Beyond*, p. 304, edited by J. E. Kim, World Scientific (1991); R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, *Lectures presented at the VII J. A. Swieca Summer School, Campos do Jordao, Brazil, 1993 CTP-TAMU-52/93*; V. Barger and R. J. N. Phillips, Wisconsin preprint, MAD/PH/765 (1993); *Properties of SUSY Particles*, L. Cifarelli and V. Khoze, Editors, World Scientific (1993).
6. H. Baer *et. al.*, Phys. Lett. **B161**, 175 (1985); G. Gamberini, Z. Phys. **C30**, 605 (1986); H. Baer, V. Barger, D. Karatas and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 96 (1987); G. Gamberini, G. Giudice, B. Mele and G. Ridolfi, Phys. Lett. **203B**, 453 (1988); R. M. Barnett, J. Gunion and H. Haber, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 1892 (1988); A. Bartl, W. Majerotto, B. Mossbacher and N. Oshimo, Z. Phys. **C52**, 477 (1991).
7. C. Albajar *et. al.* in *Aachen LHC Collider Workshop*, CERN90-10 (1990); F. Pauss, *ibid.*; H. Baer *et. al.* in *Research Directions for the Decade*, E. Berger, Editor (World Scientific, 1992); H. Baer, M. Bisset, X. Tata and J. Woodside, Phys. Rev. **D46**, 303 (1992).
8. H. Baer, X. Tata and J. Woodside, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 142 (1992).
9. The Solenoidal Detector Collaboration, Technical Design Report, SDC92-201 (1992).

10. GEM Collaboration, Technical Design Report, GEM-TN-93-262 (1993).
11. T. Tsukamoto, K. Fujii, H. Murayama, M. Yamaguchi and Y. Okada, KEK preprint 93-146 (1993), to appear in Phys. Rev. **D**.
12. J. Lopez, D. Nanopoulos, G. Park, X. Wang and A. Zichichi, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 2164 (1994).
13. H. Baer, M. Drees, C. Kao, M. Nojiri and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 2148 (1994).
14. H. Baer, C-H. Chen, R. Munroe, F. Paige and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 1046 (1995).
15. See *e.g.* H. P. Nilles, Ref.[5]
16. H. Baer, M. Drees, R. Godbole, J. Gunion and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 725 (1991).
17. H. Baer, J. Sender and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 4517 (1994).
18. F. Paige and S. Protopopescu, in *Supercollider Physics*, p. 41, ed. D. Soper (World Scientific, 1986); H. Baer, F. Paige, S. Protopopescu and X. Tata, in *Proceedings of the Workshop on Physics at Current Accelerators and Supercolliders*, J. Hewett, A. White and D. Zeppenfeld, Editors (Argonne National Laboratory, 1993).
19. D. Schaile, Fortsch. Phys. **42**, 429 (1994).
20. See *e.g.* G. Giacomelli and P. Giacomelli, Riv. Nuovo Cimento, **16**, 1 (1993).
21. M. Paterno, *presented at the SUSY 94 Conference, Ann Arbor, MI*.
22. F. Abe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3439 (1992).
23. R. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 725 (1992); J. Hisano *et al.* Nucl. Phys. **B402**, 46 (1993); J. Lopez, D. Nanopoulos and H. Pois, Phys. Rev. **D47**, 2468 (1993).
24. L. Roszkowski, Phys. Lett **B252**, 471 (1990).
25. B. Barish, *et al.*, Presented at the *Int. Conf. on High Energy Physics, Glasgow, Scotland, July 20-26, 1994* CLEO-CONF-94-1 (1994)
26. C. Dionisi *et al.* in *Proc. ECFA Workshop on LEP 200*, CERN 87-08; M. Chen *et al.* Phys. Rep. 159, 201 (1988).
27. S-L. Wu *et al.* in *Proc. ECFA Workshop on LEP 200*, CERN 87-08.
28. H. Baer, C-H. Chen, F. Paige and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 3283.
29. T. Kamon, J. Lopez, P. McIntyre and J. T. White, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 5676 (1994).
30. H. Baer *et al.* to appear in *Electroweak Symmetry Breaking*, edited by T. Barklow, S. Dawson, H. Haber and J. Seigrist (World Scientific, 1995).
31. H. Baer, C. Kao and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D48**, R2978 (1993) and Hawaii preprint, UH-511-807-94 Phys. Rev. **D** (in press).
32. CDF Collaboration, submitted to *27 International Conference on High Energy Physics*, Glasgow, Scotland, Fermilab-Conf-94/149-E (1994); D0 Collaboration, presented at *9th Topical Workshop on $\bar{p}p$ Collider Physics*, Tsukuba, Japan, Fermilab-Conf-94-036-E (1994).
33. H. Baer, C. Kao and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D48** (1993) 5175, and references therein.
34. H. Baer, C-H. Chen, C. Kao and X. Tata, paper in preparation.
35. K. Hikasa and M. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. **D36** (1987) 724.
36. ATLAS Collaboration, Letter of Intent, CERN/LHCC/92-4 (1992). The values of the reach shown in Table 5 are in agreement with the updated numbers in the ATLAS Technical proposal, CERN/LHCC 94-3.
37. H. Baer, C-H. Chen, F. Paige and X. Tata, Hawaii preprint UH-511-817-95.
38. R. M. Barnett, J. F. Gunion and H. E. Haber, Phys. Lett. **B315**, 369 (1993).

39. H. Baer, C-H. Chen, F. Paige and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 4508 (1994).
40. M. Drees and M. Nojiri, Phys. Rev. **D49** (1994) 4595.
41. JLC-1, KEK Report 92-16 (1992).
42. H. Baer, A. Bartl, D. Karatas, W. Majerotto and X. Tata, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A4**, 4111 (1989).
43. SUSYGEN, S. Katsanevas and S. Melachroinos.
44. The CMS Collaboration, Technical proposal, CERN/LHCC 94-38 (1994); The ATLAS Collaboration Technical Proposal, Ref.[36]. See also T. Virdee (*these Proceedings*).
45. P. Janot in *Proc. of the Workshop on Physics and Experiments with Linear Colliders*, Waikaloa, Hawaii, F. Harris, S. Olsen, S. Pakvasa and X. Tata, Editors (World Scientific, 1993).
46. J. L. Feng and D. Finnell, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 2369 (1994).
47. Y. Nir and N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B309**, 337 (1993).
48. J. L. Feng, M. E. Peskin, H. Murayama and X. Tata, Hawaii preprint, UH-511-804-94 (1995).
49. H. Baer, D. Karatas and X. Tata, Phys. Rev. **D42**, 2259 (1990).
50. H. Baer *et. al.* Ref.[7]; A. Bartl, W. Majerotto and W. Porod, Z. Phys. **C64**, 499 (1994).

Fig. 2. Regions of the $m_0 - m_{1/2}$ plane where the trilepton signals are observable above background at the Tevatron Main Injector upgrade (1 fb^{-1}) and at the proposed TeV* upgrade with an integrated luminosity of 25 fb^{-1} . This figure has been produced by C-H. Chen.

Fig. 3. Regions of the supergravity parameter space that can be explored at the Tevatron and its Main Injector upgrade or at LEP II. The region below the hatched line is already excluded by current experiments. The 3ℓ reach, in this figure, is only approximate since it was not obtained from a complete simulation. This may be compared to the corresponding reach shown in Fig. 2 obtained from a detailed simulation of trilepton events. The region that can be probed via $\cancel{E}_T$ and multilepton signals from gluinos and squarks (see Table 1) may roughly be obtained from the right hand scale in the figure which has been taken from Ref.[14].

Fig. 4. The regions of the $m_0 - m_{1/2}$ plane that might be explored in various channels at the LHC with an integrated luminosity of 10 fb^{-1} . The clean 3ℓ signal allows the exploration of most of the plane below the boundary of the spoiler mode if $\mu < 0$. For positive values of μ , the situation is similar to Fig. 2 in that there are holes for $400 \text{ GeV} \lesssim m_0 \lesssim 1000 \text{ GeV}$. Also shown are regions where slepton signals should be observable at the LHC and where chargino and Higgs boson signals might be observable at LEP II. This figure is from Ref.[37].

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503302v1>

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503302v1>

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503302v1>

This figure "fig2-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-ph/9503302v1>